



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769,011	01/24/2001	Michael Betts	KOB-0004	5539

7590 09/24/2004  
Philmore H. Colburn II  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002

EXAMINER

JONES, DAVID

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/769,011	BETTS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	David L Jones	2622	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 April 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: Figure 1, #20', #22', #24'. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The terms "a SCS task routine, a XES task routine" in claims 5, 13, and 22 are a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. The term "a SCS task routine, a XES task routine" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Applicant uses the same terms in the specification (page 7, lines 6-9) and the only explanation found within the specification lists them as language standards. The examiner has looked in commonly used reference materials (i.e. IEEE Dictionary Seventh

Art Unit: 2622

Edition, Newton's Telecom Dictionary 10<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Edition's, Whatis.com

(<http://whatis.techtarget.com>), Google) and was unable to ascertain the meaning of the term.

3. The terms "a Coax task routine, or a Twinax task routine" in claim 6, 15, and 24 are a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. The term " a Coax task routine, or a Twinax task routine " is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Applicant uses the same terms in the specification (page 7, lines 12-14) and the examiner has looked in commonly used reference materials (i.e. IEEE Dictionary Seventh Edition, Newton's Telecom Dictionary 10<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Edition's, Whatis.com (<http://whatis.techtarget.com>), Google) and was unable to ascertain the meaning of the term.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-10, 13-14, 16-19, 22-23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. (US 6,012,070) and further in view of Copy Craft Printers, Inc. (dated 1/11/1998).

**Regarding claim 1**, Cheng et al. (Cheng) teaches method of document processing comprising:

receiving at a supplier system (fig 2, column 5, lines 64-67 and column 6, lines 1-13), via a network, customer request data corresponding to a deliverable printed product,

initiating task routines in response to selections made from a menu at the supplier system, said tasks routines selected in accordance with determinations made from the customer request data and include selections from a management task routine (login to DDS), an archival task routine (#48), a retrieval task routine (#48), a forms task routine (#44), a scanning task routine, an accounting task routine (#47), a host task routine, a TIFF task routine and a CGM task routine; and

initiating a printing task routine (column 7, lines 35-37) in response to a selection from the menu at the supplier system, the printing task routine generating the print product, wherein at least one of said initiating task routines or said initiating said printing task routine comprises initiating for execution at a task system remote from the supplier system.

Cheng does not explicitly show each of the selections from the task menu. Whereas, on page 1 of Copy Craft Printers, Inc. (Copy Craft) website as shown from 1/11/1998, there include a number of printing services to choose from including: Printing (forms), Scanning, Graphic Arts (TIFF/CGM), Computer and Media (archival/retrieval), Communications (Host Task), Shipping and Receiving (management), Credit and Billing (accounting).

Cheng et al. and Copy Craft Printers, Inc. are analogous art because they both are from the same field of endeavor, image processing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the printing areas of Copy Craft Printers, Inc. with the system of Cheng et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide an inexperienced end user the ability to create customized business forms or brochures at user workstation in electronic format.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Cheng et al. with Copy Craft Printers, Inc. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

**Regarding claim 2**, Cheng teaches (column 7, lines 1-37) a document processing method wherein said initiating said printing task routine comprises said initiating for execution at the task system remote from the supplier system, the task system comprising a customer system.

**Regarding claim 5**, Cheng teaches (column 11, lines 12-18) a document processing method wherein said initiating said task routines includes initiating said host task routine to provide for initiating a SCS task routine, a META code task routine, an XES task routine, a line data task routine, **a PCL/PS task routine** (fig. 16, #110), a VIPP task routine, or an IPDS task routine.

**Regarding claim 6**, Cheng teaches (column 10, lines 24-26) a document processing method wherein said initiating said line data task routine provides for initiating a software task routine, a hardware task routine, or a hardware and software task routine.

**Regarding claim 8**, Cheng teaches (column 10, lines 2-8) a document processing method wherein said initiating said software task routine provides for initiating a Unix based task routine, **a host based task routine**, or a Windows NT based task routine.

**Regarding claim 9**, Cheng teaches a storage medium encoded with machine-readable program code for document processing, said program code including instructions for causing a computer to implement a method comprising:

receiving at a supplier system (fig 2, column 5, lines 64-67 and column 6, lines 1-13), via a network, customer request data corresponding to a deliverable printed product,

initiating task routines in response to selections made from a menu at the supplier system, said tasks routines selected in accordance with determinations made from the customer request data and include selections from a management task routine (login to DDS), an archival task routine (#48), a retrieval task routine (#48), a forms task routine (#44), a scanning task routine, an accounting task routine (#47), a host task routine, a TIFF task routine and a CGM task routine; and

initiating a printing task routine (column 7, lines 35-37) in response to a selection from the menu at the supplier system, the printing task routine generating the print product, wherein at least one of said initiating task routines or said initiating said printing task routine comprises initiating for execution at a task system remote from the supplier system.

Cheng does not explicitly show each of the selections from the task menu. Whereas, on page 1 of Copy Craft Printers, Inc. (Copy Craft) website as shown from 1/11/1998, there include a number of printing services to choose from including: Printing (forms), Scanning, Graphic Arts (TIFF/CGM), Computer and Media (archival/retrieval), Communications (Host Task), Shipping and Receiving (management), Credit and Billing (accounting).

Cheng et al. and Copy Craft Printers, Inc. are analogous art because they both are from the same field of endeavor, image processing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the printing areas of Copy Craft Printers, Inc. with the system of Cheng et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide an inexperienced end user the ability to create customized business forms or brochures at user workstation in electronic format.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Cheng et al. with Copy Craft Printers, Inc. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

**Regarding claim 10**, the claim is analogous to claim 2.

**Regarding claim 13**, the claim is analogous to claim 5.

**Regarding claim 14**, the claim is analogous to claim 6.

**Regarding claim 16**, the claim is analogous to claim 8.

**Regarding claim 17**, Cheng teaches (fig. 3, #46 & #22, column 6, lines 36-57) a storage medium encoded with machine-readable program code for document processing, said program code including instructions for causing a computer to implement a method wherein the storage medium located within a system.

**Regarding claim 18**, Cheng teaches a data signal propagated over a propagation medium, said data signal encoded with machine-readable program code for document processing, said program code including instructions for causing a computer to implement a method comprising:

receiving at a supplier system (fig 2, column 5, lines 64-67 and column 6, lines 1-13), via a network, customer request data corresponding to a deliverable printed product,

initiating task routines in response to selections made from a menu at the supplier system, said tasks routines selected in accordance with determinations made from the customer request data and include selections from a management task routine (login to DDS), an archival task



Art Unit: 2622

routine (#48), a retrieval task routine (#48), a forms task routine (#44), a scanning task routine, an accounting task routine (#47), a host task routine, a TIFF task routine and a CGM task routine; and

initiating a printing task routine (column 7, lines 35-37) in response to a selection from the menu at the supplier system, the printing task routine generating the print product, wherein at least one of said initiating task routines or said initiating said printing task routine comprises initiating for execution at a task system remote from the supplier system.

Cheng does not explicitly show each of the selections from the task menu. Whereas, on page 1 of Copy Craft Printers, Inc. (Copy Craft) website as shown from 1/11/1998, there include a number of printing services to choose from including: Printing (forms), Scanning, Graphic Arts (TIFF/CGM), Computer and Media (archival/retrieval), Communications (Host Task), Shipping and Receiving (management), Credit and Billing (accounting).

Cheng et al. and Copy Craft Printers, Inc. are analogous art because they both are from the same field of endeavor, image processing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the printing areas of Copy Craft Printers, Inc. with the system of Cheng et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide an inexperienced end user the ability to create customized business forms or brochures at user workstation in electronic format.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Cheng et al. with Copy Craft Printers, Inc. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

**Regarding claim 19**, the claim is analogous to claim 2.

**Regarding claim 22**, the claim is analogous to claim 5.

**Regarding claim 23**, the claim is analogous to claim 6.

**Regarding claim 25**, the claim is analogous to claim 8.

6. Claims 3-4, 7, 11-12, 15, 20-21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. and Copy Craft Printers, Inc. as applied to claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-10, 13-14, 16-19, 22-23, and 25 above, and further in view of Mastie et al. (US 6,373,585).

**Regarding claim 3**, Cheng and Copy Craft teach a document processing method for printing business materials for a customer. Cheng teaches (column 10, lines 41-48) the any type or number of printing machines maybe used such as conventional printing presses, or various types of ion deposition non-impact imaging equipment sold under the trademarks of MIDAX, XEIKON, INDIGO, or the like capable of printing or imaging high resolution color graphics (including photos). Copy Craft teaches under both the printing and graphic arts areas the different areas of printing available. Neither teaches that they are printing in any one of a secure printing, virtual printing, tandem printing, cluster printing, or a distribution printing.

Whereas, Mastie et al. teaches (fig. 1, column 4, lines 24-38) cluster and distribution printing where the print job is sent to the print manager 6, then sent to the print controllers 8a, 8b, or 8c on a FIFO method, from there sent to anyone of printers 12a-d.

Cheng, Copy Craft and Mastie are analogous art because they both are from the same field of endeavor, image processing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the printing method of Mastie with the systems of Copy Craft and Cheng.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a streamlined and faster printing system where it takes more time to RIP a print job than it normally does to print.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Mastie with Cheng and Copy Craft to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

**Regarding claim 4**, Cheng and Copy Craft teach a document processing method for printing business materials for a customer. However, neither teaches a distribution printing task routine. Whereas, Mastie et al. teaches (fig. 1, column 4, lines 24-38) cluster and distribution printing where the print job is sent to the print manager 6, then sent to the print controllers 8a, 8b, or 8c on a FIFO method, from there sent to anyone of printers 12a-d. And includes both an archival and retrieval routine as shown in column 4, lines 35-38.

**Regarding claim 7**, Cheng and Copy Craft teach a document processing method for printing business materials for a customer. However, neither teaches a particular hardware or software routine that includes one of a token ring, coax, or twinax routine. Whereas, Mastie includes the ability to interact within a wide variety of system architecture's to include but not limited to token ring, WAN, SAN, LocalTalk, TCP/IP, and Internet. And further that the systems available to be used on the network architecture include UNIX, O/S 2, MVS, WINDOWS, and AIX.

**Regarding claim 11**, the claim is analogous to claim 3.

**Regarding claim 12**, the claim is analogous to claim 4.

**Regarding claim 15**, the claim is analogous to claim 7.

Art Unit: 2622

**Regarding claim 20**, the claim is analogous to claim 3.

**Regarding claim 21**, the claim is analogous to claim 4.

**Regarding claim 24**, the claim is analogous to claim 7.


### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David L Jones whose telephone number is (703) 305-4675. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (7:00am - 3:30pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (703) 305-4712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David L. Jones



EDWARD COLES  
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600